

DISCUSSION DRAFT (27 July 2006)

COUNCIL OF REGIONS NISQUALLY MEETING 26 July 2006

Attendees: Chris Drivdahl (GSRO), Scott Brewer (HCCC), Julie Morgan (UCSRB), Alex Conley (YFWRB), Phil Miller (GSRO), Rollie Geppert (SRFB), Steve Leider (GSRO), Tammy Owings (SRFB), Neil Aaland (SRFB), Jeff Breckel (LCFRB), John Sims (Coast), Steve Manlow (LCFRB), Mark Wachtel (WDFW), Jim Kramer (PSSS), Bob Bugert (GSRO)

1. SRFB Criteria for Regional Allocation

Neil Aaland reviewed the SRFB assignment to IAC to develop criteria that would define allocation of funds at a region-wide basis. The SRFB would be able to review these criteria to deliberate on the eventual allocation of funds to a given region, based on its demonstrated capability to fulfill established requirements for project submission. Neil is working with LEAG and COR to develop criteria to report back to SRFB at their September meeting. Neil distributed a *draft* list of four general criteria for COR review:

- Is the regional list strategic?
- Is there an independent science review?
- How many projects of concern were submitted?
- Are affected parties engaged and supportive of the process?

He also distributed the Review Panel Oversight questions that were approved by SRFB in June. The group discussed the four proposed criteria. Their perspective is that an appropriate strategy is one that identifies projects that are focused on most important actions identified in the recovery plan, and linked to social and political constraints. An independent science review has a transparent and objective set of scientific criteria and review procedures. The COR had no specific comments on the Projects of Concern criterion. The group agreed that each region has a unique infrastructure to involve affected parties, and should report on the process for measuring the level of support of the process. Neil agreed to incorporate these comments into the final recommendations. He will meet with LEAG on 15 August on this issue and get a product back to the COR and LEAG afterwards.

2. Legislative Strategy

Chris Drivdahl asked the regions for input on the need for securing long-term funding for operations of the regions. The options are legislative appropriation directly to the regions or through the SRFB. She acknowledged that the operating funds from legislature are declining. The Salmon Recovery Account in legislature is not a feasible option. Since the regional boards are funded through June 2007, the regions agreed that it would be helpful to use this time to secure support of key legislators for long-term support after 2007. The regions agreed to request a doubling of funding to SRFB for implementation of regional recovery plans. Chris will put together a one page briefing sheet for the group.

3. Monitoring Budgets

Chris Drivdahl said that the Governor's Forum on Monitoring is currently evaluating state agency budgets for monitoring of salmon recovery activities. Jeff Breckel is the region's representative to the Forum; he was asked by them to work with regions to compare the regions' need for monitoring with those identified by the agencies. Chris and Steve Leider will provide these

DISCUSSION DRAFT (27 July 2006)

budget projections to each region and will need comments to Jeff by mid-August. The next meeting of the Forum will be on 12 September, when this will be discussed.

Chris also asked the COR whether the Forum is meeting the needs of the regions. She noted that the Forum was developed in Executive Order by Locke, and that the current administration may want to adjust the course of that work.

4. Future of Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

Chris Drivdahl said that the GSRO is to sunset in June 2007; she said there is limited support from members of the executive and legislative branches on continuing the office as it now stands. There has been discussion whether the office should broaden its scope beyond salmon recovery, to include issues related to watershed health and biodiversity. She asked the regions to solicit input from the boards if there is a need for the GSRO (or some mechanism for cross-agency support of the regions) and whether it should expand its scope. The group agreed that there is some need for some coordinating role of salmon recovery in the state, yet to look at this need in conjunction with the role and function of the SRFB and perhaps other entities involved in salmon recovery. The COR will include language on the need for cross-agency state support in the briefing sheet for funding (as discussed in topic 4).

5. The Northeast and Coast

John Sims and Mark Wachtel discussed the work to establish regions in the coast and northeast regions, respectively. The coast has several Lead Entities in place which may need to modify their organizational structure. The northeast has one—in Pend Oreille County—but it does not cover the entire region. Neither have locally-developed recovery plans from which to frame the project lists. Both are working on ways to establish some regional presence for coordination. Phil Miller and Chris Drivdahl said that there is no need for development of a regional plan; the intent is to improve their capability to coordinate on the development and submission of projects. The COR agreed on the importance of the giving these areas the capability to accomplish its goals. The COR felt that the two areas should solicit funding from the SRFB in September on start up funds, and then submit their second funding request in conjunction with the regions. The COR invited the northeast and coast to attend upcoming meetings.

6. Next steps

The COR will have a conference call on 11 September (1:00 to 3:00). The next meeting of the COR is set for October 19 (9:30 to 3:00) in Yakima.

Meeting notes by Bob Bugert (BobBugert@nwi.net)